

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11-15, and 26-29 are pending in the application, with 1, 4, 7, 11 and 12 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 4 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Allowed Claims

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 7-9, 11-15, and 26-28 are allowed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chater-Lea, U.S. Patent No. 5,822,314 (Chater-Lea). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Chater-Lea does not teach or suggest every feature recited in Applicants' amended independent claims 1 and 4. Amended independent claim 1 recites, in part, "transmitting to the mobile transceiver a time slot allocation indicating a sequential plurality of time slots which are not assigned to any mobile transceiver as available to the mobile transceiver in a time-slotted channel." Amended independent claim 4 recites, in

part, "receiving at the mobile transceiver a time slot allocation indicating a sequential plurality of time slots which are not assigned to any mobile transceiver as available to the mobile transceiver in the channel." Thus, amended claims 1 and 4 recite an access protocol which is an intermediary solution between the protocol of access with reservation and a protocol of random access. Chater-Lea does not describe or suggest the access protocol recited in amended independent claims 1 and 4.

In Chater-Lea, the base station transmits a timing indication (the frame number) to the mobile transceiver, and the mobile transceiver then signals the timing indication (frame number) of the received signal back to the base station. (Chater-Lea, col. 5, lines 11-35). Thus, Chater-Lea describes a system in which the transceiver simply transmits the frame number received from the base station back to the base station.

In contrast, in Applicants' invention, as recited in independent claims 1 and 4, the transceiver selects one of the time slots indicated in the transmitting step and indicates which of the time slots it has selected for transmission. As described above, the transceiver in Chater-Lea neither selects a time slot nor indicates a selected time slot to the base station. Thus, Chater-Lea does not teach or suggest "receiving a burst transmission from the transceiver in a selected one of said time slots, the burst transmission including a time slot indication indicating the selected one of the time slots within which the burst was transmitted," as recited in amended independent claim 1 or "selecting one of said time slots; and transmitting from the mobile transceiver a burst transmission in said selected time slot, the transmission including a time slot indication indicating the selected time slot," as recited in amended independent claim 4.

Furthermore, in Chater-Lea, the base station calculates a frame number offset from the difference in the frame number broadcasted to the transceiver and received from

the transceiver. In contrast, in Applicants' invention, as recited in independent claim 1, the time of reception of the burst from the transceiver and the received indication of which time slot was selected by the transceiver (which is transmitted in the burst) is used for synchronization. Thus, Chater-Lea does not teach or suggest "calculating from the timing of reception of said burst transmission a timing correction value for the transceiver so as to synchronise the transmission timing of said mobile transceiver with a reference timing," as recited in amended independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, independent claims 1 and 4 are patentable over Chater-Lea. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the grounds of rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Charter-Lea and Scott

Claims 3 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Charter-Lea in view of Scott, U.S. Patent No. 6,388,997 (Scott). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 3 depends from independent claim 1 and claim 29 depends from independent claim 4. The differences between the subject matter claimed in claims 1 and 4 and the disclosure of Chatter-Lea have been discussed above. Scott adds nothing to Chater-Lea that overcomes the deficiencies of Chatter-Lea relative to claims 1 and 4. For at least these reasons, and further in view of their own features, claims 3 and 29 are patentable over the combination of Chater-Lea and Scott. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Charter-Lea and Kronz

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Charter-Lea in view of Kronz, WO 99/00931 (Kronz). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 6 depends from independent claim 4. The differences between the subject matter claimed in claim 4 and the disclosure of Chatter-Lea have been discussed above. Kronz adds nothing to Chatter-Lea that overcomes the deficiencies of Chatter-Lea relative to claim 4. For at least these reasons and further in view of its own features, claim 6 is patentable over the combination of Chatter-Lea and Kronz. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Other Matters

Applicants note that the Office Action Summary incorrectly states that only claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 29 are pending in the application. Applicants believe that this is a mere typographical error. As stated above, and acknowledged by the Examiner in the Detailed Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11-15, and 26-29 are currently pending in the application. Correction in future correspondence is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will

expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lori A. Gordon", written over a horizontal line.

Lori A. Gordon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 50,633

Date: July 7, 2006

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

522252_1.DOC